

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed on August 27, 2009 has been carefully reviewed. From the Summary page, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9 and 12-26 were pending. Claims 9 and 12-18 are allowed. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 19-21 and 23-26 are indicated as rejected. Applicants' Drawings filed October 6, 2005 have been accepted. Acknowledgment has again been made of Applicants' Claim for Priority.

As an initial matter, Applicants make confirmation that the Summary page also should have indicated claim 22 as including allowable subject matter. Applicants kindly request acknowledgement in the next action.

By this response, claims 1, 7, 19-21, 23 and 25 have been amended. Claims 3 and 22 have been canceled. No statutory new matter has been added. Support for all claim amendments can be found in the original specification

In view of the claim amendments, *supra*, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4, 6-9, 12-21 and 23-26 stand in Condition for Allowance.

35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) – Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3- 4, 6-8, 19-21 and 23-26 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Murakami (US 5,462,603) in view of Sotodani et al. (JP 2000-173750), Johnsgard et al. (US 6,342,691) and Mizuno et al. (US 6,129,046). The rejection as to claim 3 is moot upon claim cancelation. The rejection as to claims 1, 4, 6-8, 19-21 and 23-26 is respectfully traversed.

As amended claim 1 incorporates the features of claims 3 and 22. Claim 22 recited allowable subject matter according to the Office Action of August 27, 2009. By amendment, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the asserted combination of Murakami, Sotodani, Johnsgard and Mizuno. Each of claims 4, 6-8, 19-21 and 23-26 also are patentably distinguishable over the combination because of their dependency upon amended claim 1. As such, the obviousness rejection must fail. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection as to claims 1, 4, 6-8, 19-21 and 23-26 are kindly solicited by Applicants.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the presently outstanding objection and rejection and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

If any fees under 37 C. F. R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 are due in connection with this filing, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Order No. 033082M282.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By:



Michael A. Makuch, Reg. No. 32,263
1130 Connecticut Avenue, NW – Suite 1130
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202)263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

Dated: November 24, 2009

SGRDC\357415.2